REMARKS

Applicant has attempted to fully comply with the election of species requirement, even though it is not agreed with. This is particularly true with respect to the Group designated as (3) above. For this Group Applicant respectfully submits that for the following reasons, all of the techniques recited in Group 3 belong to the same general class, and are thus not patentably distinct.

Electroanalytical response

DC cyclic voltammetry

DC linear scan voltammetry

DC anodic stripping voltammetry

DC cathodic stripping voltammetry

DC adsorptive stripping voltammetry

DC cyclic voltammetric stripping technique

DC staircase voltammetry

Normal pulse voltammetry

Square wave voltammetry

AC voltammetry

Chronoamperometry

Chronopotentiometry

Electrochemical Impedance Spectroscopy techniques

Polarographic techniques

All of the above-cited techniques belong to the same group that can be generically called "dynamic electrochemical techniques" [Kissinger, p.6]. All of them may be performed by using the same instrumentation - potentiostat/galvanostat [Kissinger, chapter 6]. All of them may be performed using the same setup, namely an

electrochemical cell [Kissinger, chapter 9]. All of them reflect dynamic changes triggered by application of controlled voltage (or current) displayed by changes in current (or voltage).

In the other words, all of them "apply an electrical excitation signal (often the independent variable) to some system (particular electrode-solution composition and geometry) and then monitor a response signal (dependent variable), which together with the excitation allows some description of the properties of the system" [Kissinger, p.5].

Most of them can be described in general as "voltammetry" techniques, that are considered as a one group belonging to electrochemical transient techniques [Dean, p 14.25]

This is a common practice – namely the coverage of a wide group of electroanalytical techniques - in the patent literature. Below are some examples:

- US 6,551,479, L. Graham et. al.:
 Claims 10 15 claimed potentiometry, amperometry, conductometry,
 voltammetry, culometry, cyclic voltammetric stripping respectively as species
 being not patentably distinct (much broader range of techniques as compare to our
 claim).
- 2. US 6,709,561, M. Pavlov et. al.:

 In this patent, Cyclic Voltammetric Stripping (i.e. cyclic voltammetry), Cyclic

 Pulse Voltammetric Stripping (i.e. pulse voltammetry) techniques (claim 4) and
 alternating current method (ac voltammetry, EC Impedance) (claim 6) are claimed
 as electroanalytical techniques.

- 3. US 6,808,611, Z. Sun et. al.: Claims 8-9, 16-17, and 24-25 of this patent comprise of a broad multitude of electrochemical responses (and corresponding electroanalytical techniques):
 - anodic stripping charge (Integrated Anodic Stripping Voltammetry, Integrated Cyclic Voltammetry, Integrated Cyclic Voltammetric Stripping, Pulsed Voltammetric Stripping, Anodic Stripping Chronoculometry.)
 - cathodic deposition charge (Integrated Linear Sweep Voltammetry, Integrated Cyclic Voltammetry, Integrated Staircase Voltammetry, Chronoculometry)
 - anodic stripping rate (Anodic Stripping Voltammetry, Cyclic Voltammetry, Cyclic Voltammetric Stripping, Pulsed Voltammetric Stripping)
 - cathodic deposition rate (DC voltammetry, AC voltammetry, chronopontetiometry
 - anodic stripping area (same as charge above)
 - cathodic deposition area (same as charge above)
 - electric current in miliamperes (any electroanalytical response)
 - electrical potential in milivolts (any electroanalytical response)
 - differential electrical plating potential (any differential electroanalytical technique).
 - AC current (all AC voltammetries and Electrochemical Impedance Measurements)
 - DC current (all DC Voltammetries, also pulse and Differential, and Polarography)
 - differential current (any differential electroanalytical technique).

See:

P.T. Kissinger, W. Heineman in Laboratory Techniques in Electroanalytical Chemistry

2nd Ed., Marcel Dekker, NY, 1996.

J. A. Dean, Analytical Chemistry Handbook, McGraw-Hill, 1995.

Accordingly, reconsideration of the Restriction/Election requirement in view of this response is respectfully requested.

CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

The undersigned hereby certifies that this correspondence was submitted by facsimile in the USPTO on the date shown on Page 1.

Respectfully submitted,

Ernest V. Linek Reg. No. 29,822

Attorney for Applicant Banner & Witcoff, Ltd. 28 State Street, 28th Floor Boston, MA 02109-1775

Tel: (617) 720-9600 Fax: (617) 720-9601

E-Mail: ELinek@bannerwitcoff.com

Date: November 7, 2005

Document No. 120688